



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

VOLUME XIII  
NUMBER 8

OCTOBER, 1905

WHOLE  
NUMBER 128

## THE RELIGIOUS SPIRIT IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL<sup>1</sup>

GEORGE ALBERT COE  
Northwestern University

The type of school that I shall have chiefly in mind in these remarks is the public high school. It will be necessary, of course, to make use of some general principles that are applicable to all schools, elementary and secondary, public and private. But my mind turns to the state high school most of all, because it has to meet a combination of hard problems such as besets no other educational institution. Because the high school is a state institution, it must omit various religious functions that are customary in private academies. Because it is a school for the whole people, it must heed the educational ideas of parents who measure results too largely in terms of immediate economic efficiency, and, as a consequence, it is constantly under temptation to narrow its outlook, to think of the future occupation more than of the future man. Because its pupils, coming from homes of every shade of faith and unfaith, are old enough to be awake to religious controversies, it is peculiarly exposed to suspicion and jealousies.

Nevertheless, in spite of all these limitations upon its possible religious functions, the public high school does and must stand in some positive relation to the totality of culture and civilization, and therefore to religion as an essential element thereof. Certainly

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Conference at Dartmouth College, May, 1905.

greater attention will be given to some elements of culture than to others. In particular, the tools of civilization—such as language, number, trained faculties of mind and body—must be taken possession of by the pupil. Some subjects, too, must be taught because of their immediate usability; and I have an impression that a close relation between the curriculum and practical life exercises a wholesome, stimulating influence upon all study. Yet no school may ignore the content of culture in the broad sense. No school does ignore it; for everywhere history, literature, biography, and other subjects that reveal the higher thoughts and aspirations of humanity are taught for the avowed purpose of forming the pupil's character by contact with ideals.

This is the point at which the question of religion in the schools arises. Our problem is not artificial; it is not lugged in; it is not a question merely of dealing with certain ecclesiastical parties. We must decide how we shall deal with the content of universal human culture, with the universal forces of civilization. It is not to be supposed that any school or any teacher will deal arbitrarily with the factors of human life. Certain principles for human living have been wrought out through the course of the ages and approved by the advanced portions of the race. The school must do something to make these principles and ideals effective with each new generation. To this end, human life at its best must be reflected.

That religion has an essential place among the elements of the highest culture will scarcely be denied. Some persons among us may have reached an opinion that religion is not really essential to life, and that the future will witness its gradual disappearance; but the schools cannot at present take any account of an opinion that is so far from expressing the common consciousness of civilization. The school must remain an instrument through which civilization transmits its own consciously recognized best to the new generation. In view of the content of culture, then, the school is under obligation to assume a positive and constructive attitude toward religion.

This necessity is all the more pressing because of the period of life to which the high school ministers. In a peculiar sense, adolescence is a decisive period in the formation of character. This we may assert without at all underestimating the molding power of child-

hood impressions, or the transforming power of college atmosphere and studies. The middle years of adolescence bring a kind of plasticity that is not found in parallel degree either earlier or later. The more I see of college students, the more certain I am that their character almost always receives its permanent "set" or direction, not in college, but before college life begins. The college can develop that which is undeveloped; it can intensify or restrain a dominant tendency; it can transform a life by giving content and illumination to a principle that is already there; but in all this its work is essentially subsidiary to that of the secondary school. The high school is not, in its turn, in any similar way subsidiary to the elementary school. The child comes to the high school with good or bad habits, it is true; but these habits are presently brought into a state of flux by the forces that are changing the child into an adult. At the high-school age there occurs a relatively new beginning that is not likely to be repeated. Everything becomes fluid. Ideas, feelings, impulses and instincts, likes, dislikes, personal attitudes toward everything—all share in a general reorganization which for the first time in the child's life produces what may be called in the large sense personality.

I do not mean that a turbulent adolescence is the strictly normal type. On the contrary, there is considerable reason for questioning whether adolescent storm and stress is not largely due to certain abnormal, or at least one-sided, features of our modern life. Nor do I hold that adolescence must needs be a time of abrupt reversal of childhood's notions and attitudes. With better teaching all along the line, I do not see why the child's progress from infancy to manhood might not be a continuous unfolding. But even so, that which is unfolded at one point will differ from that which comes out at another point. It will still remain the special function of adolescent training to assist the child to a new type of character—a type more social, more personal and meaningful, with deeper sentiments, and with more clearly defined as well as broader aspiration.

Now, because the high school has the youth just at the decisive moment for starting going this broader life, its responsibility is peculiarly great. Unless we are willing to make a radical break with the history of culture, we must hold that the high school should positively, constructively co-operate with the family and the church in giving a religious direction to adolescent ideals.

Some educators, it is true, take what appears to be a contrary view. Public education, they say, has no religious function whatever. Education in religion belongs to the church and the family, while the school is to be neutral or secular. This position is taken by persons who are fully convinced that general education ought to include religion, but they argue that the genius of our institutions involves a sharp and complete division of labor at this point between education by the state and education in the family and the church.

There is some truth in this view. It will surely be an important point gained when the people clearly realize that the public school system, or indeed any school system, is only a part of our educational system. There is and must be division of labor between the family, the church, and the school, and the major part of the responsibility for religious training will fall outside the state school system. But to absolve the public schools from *all* religious responsibility of a positive sort involves at least three educational fallacies:

First, it divides the historical content of culture into parts, and assumes that these parts can be communicated separately.

Second, it divides the child into parts, and assumes that these parts can be developed independently of one another.

Third, it divides the teacher into parts, and assumes that certain vital elements of his own culture can be kept out of the classroom.

In fact, the notion of a purely secular public school is an inheritance from a type of thought that has been, in principle, discarded. I trust that I shall not be misunderstood if I call it the pre-biological type of thought. It is easily recognized. It separates the individual from the race, and the human race from lower orders of life. It separates intellect from will, ethics from religion, the soul from the body, and the sacred from the secular. Of the vital correlation of studies with one another and with the demands of a growing mental organism it knows little. In short, it is the abstractly logical mode of thinking, which conceives things and qualities apart from their organic connections, and consequently conceives education in mechanical rather than vital terms. Now, many persons who have utterly outgrown the pre-biological mode of thought in most other matters seem strangely tied to it in matters pertaining to education. They would unhesitatingly say that the child is an indivisible unit, that the teacher

is an indivisible unit, that the content of culture is not a mere aggregate of separable parts; and yet they would have only a part of the child at school, only a part of the teacher in the classroom, only a part of culture recognized there. They would divide the labor of education between the school, the church, and the home; yet they do not see the necessity for unity of the three if this division of labor is to leave us any real system of education at all.

It does not appear that a school, any more than an individual, can really escape the issue between a religious and an irreligious ideal of life. Certainly, a school cannot be truly neutral toward moral principle. We all recognize that. For moral or immoral influences go into the school in the person of every teacher. But we have not stopped to notice that the same is true of religion and irreligion. One or the other goes into the schoolroom, whether we plan for it or not. Everybody who has got beyond the pre-biological mode of thought knows that the educational process is not the mechanical impact of textbook, or even of idea, upon the child's intellect, but an interaction between living beings—an interaction in which vastly more is given and received than is ever formulated. The teacher gives not merely instruction; he gives himself also. What he himself is inevitably expresses itself. This we know both from common observation and from the psychology of affective and motor processes. Though character have no speech, no language, though its voice be not heard, yet its line is gone out through all the earth, and its words to the end of the world.

If, then, we ask ourselves whether the high school shall be religious, irreligious, or neutral, the answer must be: It cannot be neutral as long as the laws of the human mind are what they are; it cannot be irreligious without setting itself against essential elements in the culture which it is set to impart. The only standpoint consistent with the facts of life and the ideals of education is the constructive one. The high school must be a constructive religious influence. If so much be granted, we are next confronted with the truly difficult question of how to make the high school a constructive religious force within the limitations imposed upon it by its relations to the state and to society. How can a school that is forbidden by law to promote religion in any of its specific organized forms, and that is under the

constant jealous scrutiny of opposing religious parties—how can such a school maintain any deliberate or systematic relations with religion at all?

We shall be helped toward an answer to this question by noting that many schools and many teachers are already doing the thing that seems so difficult in the statement of it. Our high schools are as different as the personalities that dominate them. Some schools, apparently, are largely possessed by the spirit of commercialism. Others are characterized by a different spirit. The pupil who graduates from them somehow finds it easier to believe in God and humanity. He cannot distinctly say how the school has made this impression upon him, but he knows that being in the presence of certain teachers has given him something in the way of feeling, aspiration, attitude toward life, that strengthens the religious impressions that he has received from home and church. Your high-school pupil, all boisterous and thoughtless as he may seem to be, nevertheless discriminates between teachers on precisely such grounds as these. One teacher stands in his thoughts for little more than a subject of study—he is mathematics, or Latin, or civics in visible form; the rest has made so slight an impression as to be forgotten. But other teachers are all this and yet much more. They are living spirits communicating spiritual life to their pupils. To live in the presence of such a teacher for a year or a series of years is not merely to learn a subject, but also to develop a personality.

There is, in short, such a thing as the presence or absence of the religious spirit in the secondary school, and thereby, as it seems to me, a school either approves or condemns itself. Not only is the religious spirit something other than formulas of belief, modes of worship, and forms of ecclesiastical organization; it is something that can *express* itself otherwise than in the forms of a particular religion. It can express itself in all the relations between man and man, in the appreciation of nature, in the love of truth—in short, in the entire mass of the appreciations or value-judgments in which we give meaning to the world of our experience. Everyone, indeed, does find some meaning in the world of facts, or give some meaning to it. To no one of us is the fall of an apple, or the revolution of the moon about the earth, simply a causal series—*a, b*; each of us in one

way or another brings his own personality, with its wants, into relation to the facts, and henceforth the meaning of the world is in part its contribution to our own self-realization.

To bring the religious spirit into the school means, then, that we look at nature, and history, and even business, from the standpoint of values for the personality, as well as from the standpoint of mere causal connection. It means that the teacher realizes within himself a need for divinity, and that he approaches and uses the world of fact as something that stands in relation to this need, something that is at once used to meet the need and also interpreted by the need. This constitutes, not primarily a creed or a doctrine, but an attitude and a standard of values. It may express itself in language, or it may reveal its presence in the less articulate, but not less effective, signs of emotion that make up so much of what we call personality.

In the person of the teacher, then, it is our business to see that religion does go into the school. I mean that, without any exception, teachers should be positively religious, and that no person who lacks this qualification should be considered as a candidate for a teacher's position. It is a growing mystery to me how so many persons of intelligence and reflection can assume that the essential qualities for teaching are simply knowledge of one's subject, ability to instruct, and a life free from scandal. Note that the *positive* qualifications here named concern the subject of instruction, while the qualification that concerns the personality of the teacher and the pupil is a merely negative one. How widespread this notion of teacher qualifications is, of course, no one can tell. Certainly some principals, superintendents, and boards of education have a wider vision. But it is all too obvious that many do not. We linger in the pre-biological stage of thought; for we think of education as the teaching of certain subjects, whereas it is the communication of life to young souls. It is the transmission of the spiritual life of the race through the one possible means of transmission, a living being. Education in this high sense is certainly going on in a large proportion of our schools, at least in some degree. What is needed is deliberate planning where at present much is left to chance. Religion or irreligion is in the school anyway; why, then, should we not take measures to control this part of school life in the interest of the highest educational ideals?



But it will be said that all this is theoretical, even visionary. School curricula and methods have to be set forth in specific, definable terms, so that application thereof may be made by rule and the results tested by examination. This overplus which you call the influence of personality is too intangible to be secured by planning. It is like the wind which bloweth where it listeth; we hear the sound thereof, but we cannot tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth. Our duty is to provide primarily for good instruction and good discipline. If, in addition, the incalculable qualities of high personality are added, we rejoice; but we cannot hold ourselves responsible for producing such results. Since we cannot put into the curriculum the subject of religion, defining what shall be taught and how it shall be taught, we have no specific responsibility with reference to the matter beyond the maintenance of the strict non-sectarianism enjoined by the law.

There is enough truth in this objection to give us pause. That the religious factor in education cannot be reduced to rule or measured by any marking system is true. It cannot be bought for gold; it cannot be manufactured to order; it comes, like life itself, or like conscience, or like artistic genius, out from the primal source of all things. But I should draw a different conclusion from that of the objector. Does not this need reveal to us the truly creative nature of the teacher's work? The true teacher is in many respects like an artist. Only a part of art work can be reduced to rule and tested by examination; other parts, and the more significant parts, consist in those spontaneous outgoings of personality which speak most loudly to the soul. Nevertheless, we train men and women for artistic pursuits, and we take measures to encourage the growth and expression of those elements of feeling and ideation that give what we call inspiration to the work of art. There is vastly more in good writing than can be acquired from any possible instruction in rhetoric; the personality plays an extraordinary part. Yet we know that there are ways whereby any native gift that one may have can be cultivated and brought to fruitage. The inference from all this is that the work of the teacher should be recognized as more closely akin to art, and less closely akin to mechanical trades. Perhaps teachers, like poets, are born, not made. Even so, I feel con-

fident that, as long as the parental instinct abides in the human race, there will be enough born teachers to supply the demand. Our difficulty will not be lack of persons capable of becoming good teachers, but lack of purpose and of measures adapted to bring out the latent powers of a spiritual personality. In such a situation the one essential is to create the demand, to hold up the ideal, and gently but persistently insist upon the true perspective. The teacher must become an artist in human clay. Nay, he works not with passive clay, but with living souls, and so he must become, like the Spirit of God, an inspiration and a life-giver.

The objector holds that this element in teaching is indefinite and not subject to control. On the contrary, it has definite, recognizable modes of expression. The religious spirit in the school is, indeed, vastly different from any mechanical device or rule; yet it must express itself. Modern psychology has made clear that there is a vital relation between any state of mind whatever and outgoing processes. What we call the influence of personality is, theoretically, just as capable of psychological analysis as anything else in the teaching process. It escapes analysis to a large extent because the factors are numerous, unobtrusive, and extraordinarily complicated. For this reason, one chief means of maintaining a wholesome religious spirit in the school must always be the selection of teachers who make the impression of having a spiritual personality. But we are not limited to this. The religious spirit has some easily recognizable and controllable ways of expressing itself. These can be definitely planned for and promoted, especially in the teaching of some subjects.

For example, we require the teacher to connect each subject of study with some genuine interest of the child, primarily a spontaneous interest. Now, spontaneous interests are of many kinds, and of many degrees of moral significance. Consequently, the effect upon character in the teaching of any subject depends, not merely upon the content of instruction, but also upon the interest to which the appeal is made. A recent writer has contrasted two ways of teaching reading. One way is illustrated by this: "Lucy, see if you can read that better than George did!" The other is illustrated by a class in which a little girl, after reading a paragraph, remarked, "I didn't make it mean what I think it means," and then, of her own accord,

re-read it to her own satisfaction. Both these methods of teaching reading employ a spontaneous interest, but one employs an egoistic desire to excel another person, while the other employs a social interest, namely, the desire to give adequate social expression to an idea. The two types of teaching tend to develop two types of character.

Not only the content of instruction, then, but also the kind of interest awakened in it, has a bearing upon character. Consequently, the fundamental mode in which the religious spirit consciously and deliberately expresses itself in the school is the arousing of the highest type of interest which the nature of the subject and the stage of the pupil's growth permit. In many cases this interest will not be definable in strictly religious terms; but if only its trend is in that direction, it will nevertheless contribute to religious culture. The little girl who re-read a paragraph in order that an idea might have adequate social expression was being prepared for appreciating Jesus' conception of a universal kingdom of mutual helpfulness. At the high-school age nearly the whole range of human interests is available for the teacher's use. The horizon of the adolescent is, of course, restricted, yet he is capable of experiencing in some degree every kind of ideal feeling.

In general, the religiousness of a teacher's work is measured by the degree in which the ideal interests of humanity illuminate, and warm, and vivify it. It is merely repeating the same thing in other words to say that teaching is religious in proportion as it relates the subject-matter and the pupil to the historical movement of righteousness and brotherhood and divine fatherhood that Jesus called the kingdom of God. All the products and processes of human culture are, as a matter of fact, related to the general upward struggle of humanity toward a completely ethical society, a society which requires for its completeness the whole principle of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood. Mathematics, language, science, literature—one and all are products of humanity's efforts toward ideal living, specifically in social form, and every one of them can be related by the teacher more or less closely to the ideal and social impulses of the pupil. If all other ways of awakening this human interest fail, biography, at least, remains. Every part of learning was once a vital

interest in a throbbing human breast. It is an instance of ideal aspiration of one sort or another, and it will not necessarily seem abstract or removed from life, unless we try to study the human product apart from the human being.

Generally a point of attachment to ideal interests can be found directly in the subject or in the circumstances that immediately surround teacher and pupil. Indeed, a school or a class is itself an instance of a human society existing for ideal ends. It finds complete life for itself, just as the world at large finds it, only in the realization within itself of the kingdom of God. Instruction is not one thing, and discipline another; both are phases of a single life-process going on here and now in the schoolroom. And this particular life-process is part of the whole of life. It is organically related to humanity at large. Teacher, pupil, fellow-pupil, the subject of study, the community, one's country, universal humanity—let there be no break anywhere between any of them.

This, of course, is the horizon for the teacher. The eyes of the pupil will not see all this; yet the vitality of instruction and of discipline, the effect upon character, the religiousness of it all, will depend upon the avoidance of the breaks which set teacher apart from pupil, one pupil apart from another, the subject-matter of instruction apart from life's warm interests, and so on through the list. Irreligion and immorality alike take things as mere particulars apart from their universal aspect, and in treating men as mere individuals. Everything is more than a mere particular; every man is more than an individual; every group of men is more than its mere self as a group.

In all this the essential point for our present purpose is that every subject of instruction has intrinsic bearing upon religion; that every classroom situation is a religious situation because of its relation to the largest interests of life; that every pupil has within himself the basis for a spontaneous interest that will raise any subject of instruction to the plane of religion.

Take, as an illustration, the subject that, by the common consent of students, is the most abstract and the farthest removed from spontaneous interests, pure mathematics. Here we find two types of teaching, both of which succeed, as far as mere instruction is

concerned. One teacher is a mere drill-master; to him each lesson is simply a task to be done; he induces his pupils to do their tasks by emphasis upon marks, by praise and rebuke, and by the general whirl of the machinery. The motives thus brought into play are not bad, yet they are extraneous to the subject-matter, extraneous to the social situation, extraneous to the pupil's conscious needs; separated, therefore, from the ideal unity of life at which religion aims. Another teacher, however, secures equally good work by intrinsic means. He has what may be called, in the phrase of Spinoza, the "intellectual love" of mathematical truth. Mathematical relations appeal to his feelings. To him the binomial theorem is no abstract, lifeless formula, but, like music or the colors of a sunset, it speaks a human language. His manner of exposition, and the thousand touches that an interested teacher gives to a topic, awaken the pupils. Mere imitation, indeed, takes them a long way toward their teacher's "intellectual love" of his subject. Now, this rejoicing in the truth indicates an expansion of the ideal side of human nature. It makes life deeper, more serious, more responsive. Here is spiritual growth. Here is the very experience in which Plato and Augustine and many others have confessed that they found God.

In other subjects the possibility of a religious touch is more obvious. Everything that concerns history and literature, for example, brings us with considerable definiteness into the presence of the human heart, with its hopes and ideals and struggles. Even here, however, it is possible to abstract the human product from humanity. The study of history may degenerate into the learning of dates and dead facts; the study of literature, into the learning of empty forms of literary structure. I firmly believe in the need of instruction in the formal elements of culture, and of accuracy everywhere. I am so conservative as to think that students should learn to spell! It is possible so to undervalue form as to leave the student's mind unorganized. But, after all, form itself multiplies its educational effectiveness when it is the vehicle of a rich content. And it is the content that furnishes the chief means of developing a content-ful, that is positive, character. By drill upon the formal elements of culture you may, indeed, develop industry, control of attention, and accuracy; but these are formal or negative qualities of character.

One might almost say that they are conditions of character rather than character itself. There is still lacking any reference to the content of true living. All these formal elements are capable of a bad as well as a good use. The positive direction of the life, the aims that it accepts as really worth while—these are to be influenced by the content rather than the form of the subject. Now, the content of all studies in history and literature may be so selected and taught as to make a total impression of either one of two kinds: either of some particular historical facts or special instances of literary beauty abstracted from the movement of life in which they originated; or of the deeper springs of life bubbling up at these particular points in a special way. All that is needed to make the teaching religious is to appreciate the deeper reality in the special case. For the deeper reality is man himself in his efforts toward ideal existence.

Professor Lamprecht has told us that history is applied psychology. It is the inner man expressing himself. This point of view is prevailing more and more, and it is bound to prevail. Sociology, political science, even economics, are becoming so many studies of the mind of man as it acts in these several sorts of situation. Now, the mind of man is an organic whole, not a mechanical aggregate. As a consequence, any science, even psychology itself, becomes abstract in proportion as it separates its facts from their original setting in the unity of the human personality. For various purposes such abstraction is necessary, especially in the higher reaches of learning. But for adolescents who are just in the process of forming their characters, it is of the highest importance that a true picture of human nature in its unity should be presented.

Such a picture will necessarily bring religion in the concrete before the student's mind, and the frequency with which this is done can be determined somewhat by the selection of material and method of treatment. What is needed here is not dogmatic instruction, nor yet preaching. No effort need be made to prove the existence of God. The essential requirement is that the teacher give simple, sympathetic recognition to religion in the concrete. It is to be assumed that the pupil has received some instruction in religion from the family and the church, and this instruction is not to be repeated or corrected or added to. Its general truth, however, is to be assumed, religious

facts are to be treated with sympathetic appreciation, and thus the atmosphere of the school is to become a religious atmosphere.

Further, in the discipline of the school, religious motives can be appealed to, particularly motives growing out of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men. Why should not a child in school be encouraged to gratitude, filial reverence, and loving obedience toward God? Why should we conceal from any pupil that the proper organization of the schoolroom and the proper carrying on of school sports constitute one part of the universal kingdom of God? Why need we hesitate to assume that Jesus is the moral leader of our civilization? How better can we learn to love our enemies and do good to those that persecute us; to give the cup of cold water; to feed the hungry and minister to the sick and to prisoners; to stand for principle against the crowd, and to suffer, if need be, in a righteous cause—how can we learn these things better than by specific reference to the life of Jesus?

To use these motives is not to take sides with any party; for all parties use them in substantially the same way. The dividing-points between religious sects are not particular feelings and motives, but theories about them, and modes of ecclesiastical organization and life. There is a broad band of light in which Protestant and Catholic, Jew and gentile, aim at the same type of conduct, feel the same feelings, employ the same motives. Such religious motives may be awakened and used without a shadow of disloyalty to our constitutional and statutory prohibitions of sectarianism.

I have already indicated some of the special functions of the high school in this work. In general, the great fact with which adolescent psychology has to deal is the new development of the social nature, and as a corollary a new development of self-consciousness. This is the point from which to view all the sentiment and idealizing and self-assertiveness of the period. For this reason, the most effective access to the adolescent personality is through social motives. Religious culture will come from the broadening of the social sympathies toward the ideal of the kingdom of God. History, literature, government, science, should therefore be taught with constant reference to their larger human meaning, and so with reference to that divine meaning of all things which is most completely expressed in the thought of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men.

How great is the need of this deeper kind of teaching just now! The high school is asked to prepare its pupils for specific vocations, and the real ethical and spiritual meaning of all vocations is being lost sight of. We try to make mechanics, accountants, teachers, business men, without stopping to ask why there should be trades and professions at all. Doubtless the school system ought to respond to the demand for preparation for specific vocations, but all the greater is the reason for the religious spirit.

Think, too, of the direct influence of modern conditions of life. Think of its excessive number of interests, of its publicity, of its unrest. The adolescent in modern civilization is under constant stimulation, and the tendency of it all is to incite him to many kinds of self-expression of the less profound sort, rather than to any unification of the personality. Now, the personality attains unity and self-possession only through some such process as that which I have described. On behalf of sorely burdened adolescents, tossed hither and thither by the multifarious interests of our complex civilization, I plead for the religious spirit in the high school. This, and this only, will develop personality, which is the end of all our education.

#### SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>

1. The high school should assume a positive attitude toward the entire content of human culture, which includes religion as an essential part.

2. This necessity is all the more pressing because of the peculiarly formative period of life to which the high school ministers.

3. The notion that public education should be secular grows out of the pre-biological mode of thought, which fails to recognize the unity of the pupil, of the teacher, and of the content of culture. Religious, as well as ethical, neutrality in the school is impossible.

4. The prime necessity is that every teacher should be positively religious.

5. Then, that each subject be taught by appealing to interests that lead on toward the highest conception of life. This is possible, even though the content of instruction have little direct relation to religion.

<sup>1</sup> Not read at the Conference.



6. All subjects of instruction have some positive relation, more or less intimate or remote, to the ideal interests that culminate in religion. This relation should be brought out or this interest cultivated.

7. Every classroom situation, and the whole organization and discipline of the school, stand in some relation to the universal kingdom of God. This relation may be brought out without either preaching or dogmatic instruction.

8. Special accent should be placed upon the content of studies that deal with human life in the concrete. Here the ideal strivings of men can be brought out as a revelation of what life is.

9. Religious motives employed by all religious sects can be used in connection with the whole work and discipline of the school.

10. In general, the adolescent is to be led toward religion through the social feelings and appreciations. Hence, the kingdom of God in the world is the central thought. Modern life brings a peculiar need of this interpretation of life's interests.